

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

JS-6

**CIVIL MINUTES -- GENERAL**

Case No. **CV 13-7037-JFW (AJWx)**

Date: September 25, 2013

Title: PRD, LLC.-v- Roana C. Gonzalez, et al.

**PRESENT:**

**HONORABLE JOHN F. WALTER, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**

**Shannon Reilly  
Courtroom Deputy**

**None Present  
Court Reporter**

**ATTORNEYS PRESENT FOR PLAINTIFFS:**

None

**ATTORNEYS PRESENT FOR DEFENDANTS:**

None

**PROCEEDINGS (IN CHAMBERS):**

**ORDER REMANDING ACTION TO LOS ANGELES  
SUPERIOR COURT**

On July 23, 2013, Plaintiff PRD, LLC ("Plaintiff") filed a Complaint for Unlawful Detainer against Defendants Roana C. Gonzalez and Edgar M. Gonzalez ("Defendants") in Los Angeles Superior Court. On September 23, 2012, Defendants filed a Notice of Removal, alleging that this Court has jurisdiction.

Federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction, having subject matter jurisdiction only over matters authorized by the Constitution and Congress. See *Bender v. Williamsport Area School District*, 475 U.S. 534, 541 (1986). "Because of the Congressional purpose to restrict the jurisdiction of the federal courts on removal, the statute is strictly construed, and federal jurisdiction must be rejected if there is any doubt as to the right of removal in the first instance." *Duncan v. Stuetzle*, 76 F.3d 1480, 1485 (9th Cir. 1996) (citations and quotations omitted). There is a strong presumption that the Court is without jurisdiction unless the contrary affirmatively appears. See *Fifty Associates v. Prudential Insurance Company of America*, 446 F.2d 1187, 1190 (9th Cir. 1990). As the party invoking federal jurisdiction, Defendants bear the burden of demonstrating that removal is proper. See, e.g., *Gaus v. Miles*, 980 F.2d 564, 566 (9th Cir. 1992); *Emrich v. Touche Ross & Co.*, 846 F.2d 1190, 1195 (9th Cir. 1988).

Defendants fail to meet their burden of demonstrating that removal is proper. Plaintiff's Complaint alleges one claim for unlawful detainer under state law. While Defendants allege in their Notice of Removal that the claim arises under federal law, "[a]n unlawful detainer action does not raise a question arising under federal law and so, once removed, must be remanded for lack of

jurisdiction.” *Cooper v. Washington Mut. Bank*, 2003 WL 1563999, \*2 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 19, 2003) (internal citation omitted). Accordingly, there is no federal question jurisdiction presented by Plaintiff’s action.

For the foregoing reasons, this Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction over this action. Accordingly, this action is **REMANDED** to Los Angeles Superior Court for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. See 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c).

IT IS SO ORDERED.